

REMARKS

Responsive to the Office Action mailed on September 6, 2005 in the above-referenced application, Applicant respectfully requests amendment of the above-identified application in the manner identified above and that the patent be granted in view of the arguments presented. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

Present Status of Application

Withdrawn claims 17 and 20-24 are rejoined with the application. Claim 30 is objected to for informalities. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 17, 20 and 23-33 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohgami et al (US 5,905,550). Claims 6, 8, 11-16, 21 and 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In this paper, claims 6 and 8 are amended to include the limitations of claim 1. Claim 21 is amended to include the limitations of claim 17. Claim 30 is amended according to the suggestion of the Examiner. Thus, on entry of this amendment, claims 1, 4-8, 11-17, 20-33 remain in the application.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and the remarks contained below.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his indication in the Office Action that claims 6, 8, 11-16, 21 and 22 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 6 and 8 are rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of claim 1. Applicant therefore submits that claims 6 and 8 are now in condition for allowance. Insofar as claims 11-16 depend from claim 8, it is Applicant's belief that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Claim 21 is rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of claim 17. Applicant therefore submits that claim 21 is in condition for allowance. Insofar as claim 22 depends from claim 21, it is Applicant's belief that this claim is also in condition for allowance.

Rejections Under 25 U.S.C. 102(b)

After the amendment, claims 1, 4-5, 7, 17, 20, and 23-33 stand finally rejected over Ohgami et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for the reasons as follow.

Independent claims 1, 17, 26 and 27 each recite a frame disposed on a side of an LCD module having a first opening and a second opening, both on a lateral side thereof, and a hook, wherein the hook is inserted through the first opening with the tail located at the second opening. The hook extends from one of an arm connected to an electronic device (claim 1), a housing covering an electronic device (claim 17), a fixing member (claim 26), and a fixing member connected to an electronic device (claim 27).

Ohgami et al teach a casing for a display device. The casing 15 comprises a display cover 20 and a display mask 21 detachably coupled to each other to house a color liquid crystal display (LCD) 30.

The teaching of Ohgami et al is mischaracterized in the office action.

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's reliance on display mask 21 of Ohgami et al to teach the arm, fixing member, or housing covering an electronic device as recited in claims 1, 17, 26 and 27 of the present application. It is quite clear from Figs. 1 and 2 and their related description that display mask 21 is an element of the housing of the LCD 30. It cannot fairly be construed as the arm, fixing member, or housing covering an electronic device recited in the claims.

Furthermore, Applicant notes that claim 24 recites that the electronic device is a main body of a notebook computer. Thus, in claim 24, the hook extends from a housing covering the main body of a notebook computer. In the rejection of claim 17, from which claim 24 depends, the Examiner relies on circuit board 46 and dial 49 of Ohgami et al to teach the electronic device of

the claim. It is noted that these elements are not the main body of a notebook computer. It is further noted that display mask 21, which the Examiner relies upon to teach the housing, does not cover and is not connected to main body 2 of the notebook computer in Ohgami et al. It is finally noted that the pushing portion 75 which the Examiner relies upon as the hook is not connected to the main body of the notebook computer. See Figs. 1, 2 and 12 of Ohgami et al.

Ohgami et al fail to teach or suggest a frame disposed on a side of an LCD module having a first opening and a second opening, both on a lateral side thereof, and a hook, wherein the hook is inserted through the first opening with the tail located at the second opening, as recited in claims 1, 17, 26 and 27.

To anticipate a claim, a reference must teach every element of the claim. In this regard, the Federal Circuit has held:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

"The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The plain meaning of the term "opening" is an aperture or a gap. Thus, the claims define a frame having **two** apertures or gaps on a lateral side thereof, wherein a hook is inserted through one such aperture or gap with the tail located at the other aperture or gap.

With reference to Fig. 12, on which the Examiner relies to teach the two openings of the claims, Applicant notes that a cross-section of display cover 20 and display mask 21 is illustrated. As clearly shown in Fig. 12, the pushing portion 75 is received into a single aperture (opening 72) in the lateral side of display cover 20. ***The "bottom portion" of the opening 72, which the Examiner relies upon to teach the second opening of claims 1, 17, 26 and 27, is***

not an opening in the lateral side of the display cover 20, but a recess formed in the single opening 72.

Stated differently, an object in which two openings are defined on a surface thereof distinguishes over an object in which a single opening is defined on a surface thereof and a recess formed in the single opening. These are two very different structures.

Applicant therefore submits that Ohgami et al fail to teach a frame having ***a first and a second opening on a lateral surface thereof***, as recited in claims 1, 17, 26 and 27.

Furthermore, as the recess in the bottom portion of opening 72 in which the "tail" 25 of pushing portion 75 is located is not a second opening in a lateral surface of display cover 20, it follows that the reference further fails to teach the limitation that a hook is inserted through the first opening ***with the tail located at the second opening***, as recited in the claims.

For at least the reasons described above, it is Applicant's belief that Ohgami et al fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 1, 17, 26 and 27. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 17, 26 and 27 be withdrawn and the claim passed to issue. Insofar as claims 4-5, 7, 20, and 23-25 and 28-33 depend from claims 1, 17, 26 and 27 either directly or indirectly, and therefore incorporate all of the limitations of claims 1, 17, 26 and 27, it is Applicant's belief that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

The Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests so.

Respectfully submitted,



Nelson A. Quintero

Reg. No. 52,143

Customer No. 34,283

Telephone: (310) 401-6180

P113686NAQ